



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,515	07/06/2001	Michael Freed	1014-056US01/JNP-0251	4141
72689	7590	05/29/2008		
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A. 1625 RADIO DRIVE, SUITE 300 WOODBURY, MN 55125			EXAMINER MOORTHY, ARAVIND K	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 05/29/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pairedocketing@ssiplaw.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/900,515
Filing Date: July 06, 2001
Appellant(s): FREED ET AL.

Kent J. Sieffert
Reg. No. 41,312
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7 February 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 7 August 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,484,257	Ellis	11-2002
6,052,728	Fujiyama et al	04-2000
6,473,425	Bellaton et al	10-2002
6,415,329	Gelman et al	07-2002
5,293,424	Holtey et al	03-1994
6,253,337	Maloney et al	06-2001
6,389,462	Cohen et al	05-2002
6,009,502	Bocuf	12-1999
6,094,485	Weinstein et al	07-2000
6,820,215	Harper et al	11-2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-8, 11, 45-47, 51 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1.

As to claim 1, Ellis discloses a method for secure communications between a client and a server, comprising:

managing a communications negotiation between the client and the server through an intermediate device that supports a direct mode and a proxy mode [column 7 line 11 to column 8 line 27];

receiving encrypted data packets from the client with the intermediate device [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

decrypting each encrypted data packet with the intermediate device [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

forwarding unencrypted data packets from the intermediate device to the server using a communication session negotiated by the client and the server when the intermediate device operates in direct mode [column 7 line 11 to column 8 line 27];

forwarding unencrypted data packets from the intermediate device to the server using a communication session negotiated by the server and the intermediate device when the intermediate device operates in proxy mode [column 7 line 11 to column 8 line 27];

receiving data packets from the server [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

encrypting the data packets from the server [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49]; and

forwarding encrypted data packets to the client [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49].

As to claim 2, Ellis discloses that the step of managing comprises:

receiving TCP session negotiation data from the client and modifying the negotiation data prior to forwarding the negotiation data to the server to establish the communications session between the client and the server when operating in direct mode [column 8, lines 28-53].

As to claim 3, Ellis discloses modifying a SYN request from the client to the server to alter the packet transmission parameters [column 8, lines 28-53].

As to claim 4, Ellis discloses that the step of modifying includes modifying at least a maximum segment size value of the data packet [column 6, lines 32-56].

As to claim 5, Ellis discloses that the method further includes the steps of negotiating an SSL session with the client [column 2, lines 36-49].

As to claim 6, Ellis discloses that decrypting comprises decrypting SSL encrypted packet data, and wherein encrypting comprises encrypting a data packet with SSL [column 2, lines 36-49].

As to claim 7, Ellis discloses the step of managing comprises receiving with the intermediate device communication negotiation data directed to the server from the client and

responding to the negotiation in place of the server when the intermediate device operates in proxy mode [column 7 line 11 to column 8 line 27].

As to claim 8, Ellis discloses negotiating the communications session between the server and the intermediate device as a separate TCP session [column 8, lines 28-53].

As to claim 11, Ellis discloses prior to the step of receiving encrypted data, of negotiating an encrypted data communications session between the intermediate device and the client [column 9 line 51 to column 10 line 11].

As to claim 45, Ellis discloses an secure sockets layer processing acceleration device, comprising:

- a client communication engine establishing a secure communications session with a client device via an open network [column 7 line 11 to column 8 line 27];

- a server communication engine establishing an open communications session with a server via a secure network [column 7 line 11 to column 8 line 27];
- and

- an encryption and decryption engine operable on encrypted data packets received via the open communications session and on clear data received via the open communications session [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49],

- wherein the communication engine supports: (1) a direct mode in which decrypted data packets are forwarded to the servers using a communication session negotiated by the client and the server, and (2) a proxy mode in which the acceleration device responds to the client on behalf of the server and forwards the

decrypted data packets to the server using the open communications session established by the acceleration device and the server [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49].

As to claim 46, Ellis discloses that when operating in direct mode the communication engine forwards modified communication session data to the server over the communication session between the client device and the server [column 7 line 11 to column 8 line 27].

As to claim 47, Ellis discloses that when operating in proxy mode the communication engine acts as a proxy for a plurality of servers in communication with the SSL acceleration device [column 2, lines 36-49].

As to claims 51 and 53, Ellis discloses automatically switching the intermediate device from the direct mode to the proxy mode upon detection of a communication error associated with the direct mode [column 7 line 11 to column 8 line 27].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 12, 14 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 as applied to claims 1 and 45 above, and further in view of Fujiyama et al U.S. Patent No. 6,052,728.

As to claims 12 and 48, Ellis does not teach that the step of managing comprises maintaining a database of entries on each session of data packets communicated between the client and the server.

Fujiyama et al teaches maintaining a log of entries on each session of data packets communicated between the client and the server [column 14, lines 9-23].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis so that there would have been a relay computer that would have maintained a log of entries n each session of data packets communicated between the client and the server.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis by the teaching of Fujiyama et al, as described above, because it provides a method to help locate the cause of a problem that occurs during communication [column 1, lines 24-27].

As to claim 14, the Ellis-Fujiyama combination teaches that the entry further includes an initialization vector [Fujiyama et al column 6, lines 56-65].

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Fujiyama et al U.S. Patent No. 6,052,728 as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Bellaton et al U.S. Patent No. 6,473,425 B1.

As to claims 13 and 15, the Ellis-Fujiyama combination teaches that the database includes an entry for a session comprising a session ID [Fujiyama et al column 7, lines 58-62].

The Ellis-Fujiyama combination does not teach that the database includes a TCP Sequence number and an SSL session number. The Ellis-Fujiyama combination does not teach that the entry includes an expected ACK.

Bellaton et al teaches entries that include a TCP Sequence number, SSL session number and an expected ACK [column 8 line 53 to column 9 line 20].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Fujiyama combination so that a TCP Sequence number, SSL session number and an expected ACK would have been included in the database entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Fujiyama combination by the teaching of Bellaton et al, as described above, because implementing this method and by comparing a new packet to packets already queued for transmission, unnecessary duplicated transmission of a packet can be avoided where packet transmission has been delayed. Avoiding retransmission of the queued packet avoids aggravating the network congestion [column 5 line 66 to column 6 line 7].

Claims 16, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gelman et al U.S. Patent No. 6,415,329 B1.

As to claims 16 and 17, Ellis teaches receiving encrypted data packets, as discussed above for claim 1.

Ellis does not teach that the step of receiving the encrypted data packets includes receiving data packets including encrypted application data spanning multiple packets, and the step of forwarding includes forwarding a portion of the application data contained in an individual encrypted TCP segments to the server without authentication. Ellis does not teach that the step of authenticating the application data on receipt of all packets including the application data.

Gelman et al teaches receiving packets that includes application data spanning multiple packets, and the step of forwarding includes forwarding a portion of the application data contained in an individual TCP segments to the server without authentication [column 9, lines 16-65]. Gelman et al teaches the step of authenticating the application data on receipt of all packets including the application data [column 9, lines 16-65].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis so that the step of receiving the encrypted data packets would have included receiving the data packets that fragmented the application data. The step of forwarding would have included forwarding a portion of the application data contained in the individual fragmented TCP segments to the server without authentication. The application data would have been authenticated on receipt of all the packets including the application data.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis by the teaching of Gelman et al, as described above,

because fragmenting the packets maintains a low susceptibility to transmission errors and makes it difficult for a third party to intercept the application [column 2, lines 58-63].

As to claim 19, Ellis teaches that the data is buffered for a length sufficient to complete a block cipher used to encrypt the data [column 9 line 51 to column 10 line 11].

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Gelman et al U.S. Patent No. 6,415,329 B1 as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Holtey et al U.S. Patent No. 5,293,424.

As to claim 18, the Ellis-Gelman combination is silent on the data not being buffered during decryption.

Holtey et al teaches data not being buffered during decryption [column 4 line 59 to column 5 line 2].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Gelman combination so that the data would not have been buffered during decryption.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Gelman combination by the teaching of Holtey et al, as described above, because buffering is a time consuming process and the buffered data is subject to attack [column 4 line 59 to column 5 line 2].

Claims 20-22, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 in view of Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1.

As to claim 20, Ellis discloses a method for secure communications between a client and one of a plurality of servers performed on an intermediary device, comprising:

establishing a communications session between the client and the one of the plurality of servers by receiving negotiation data from the client intended for the server and forwarding the negotiation data in modified form to the server, and receiving negotiation data from the server intended for the client and forwarding the negotiation data to the client to establish the client and the server as terminations for the communications session [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

establishing a secure communications session between the client and the intermediary device [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

receiving encrypted application data from the client at the intermediary device by the secure communication session between the intermediary device and the client [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

decrypting the application data [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];
and

forwarding decrypted application data from the intermediary device to the one of the plurality of servers using the communications session established between the client and the server [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49].

Ellis does not teach:

maintaining a database of the secure communications session including information on the session/packet associations.

Maloney et al teaches maintaining a database of the secure communications session including information on the session/packet associations [column 6, lines 33-51].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis so that the proxy server would have had a log that maintained records of the secure communications session including information on the session/packet associations.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis by the teaching of Maloney et al because without introducing additional traffic on a network, the system produces a virtual picture of network usage and network vulnerabilities. By organizing the inputs of multiple collection tools into visual schematics, Security Administrators become proactive in assessing network weaknesses and in identifying optimum locations for implementing security measures. With the information revealed by the system of the present invention, Security Administrators can identify potential traffic bottlenecks, locate the existence of backdoors, reduce bandwidth usage, develop profiles of users, and pinpoint illicit activity [column 1, lines 57-67].

As to claim 21, Ellis teaches the method further including the steps of:

receiving at the intermediary device application data from the server
destined for the client [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

encrypting the application data at the intermediary device [column 8 line
54 to column 9 line 49]; and

forwarding the application data to the client along the secure
communication session established between the intermediary device and the client
[column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49].

As to claim 22, Ellis teaches that the method further includes the step of selecting one of
the plurality of servers for each packet in the communications session and mapping all
communications intended for the server to the one of the plurality of servers [column 10 line 61
to column 11 line 4].

As to claim 27, the Ellis-Maloney combination teaches that the entry further includes an
initialization vector [column 10 line 61 to column 11 line 4].

As to claim 29, Ellis teaches that the step of forwarding includes:

forwarding data which spans over multiple TCP segments and forwarding
data which is not authenticated [column 8, lines 28-54].

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Cohen et al U.S. Patent No. 6,389,462 B1.

As to claim 23, the Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach that forwarding the application to the data comprises receiving packets from the one of the plurality of servers and modifying the source and destination addresses of the packet to forward the packet to the client.

Cohen et al teaches receiving packets from one of the plurality servers and modifying the source and destination addresses of the packet to return the packet to the client [column 9 line 19 to column 10 line 31].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that the proxy would have received packets from one of the servers and modified the source and destination addresses of the packet to return the packet to the client.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Cohen et al, as described above, because address translation by a proxy server reduces latency and minimizes traffic onto and off of the network [column 1, lines 44-58].

As to claim 24, the Ellis-Maloney combination teaches that the step of decrypting application data comprises decrypting data and forwarding the data on to the one of the plurality of servers via a secure network [Ellis column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49].

As to claim 25, the Ellis-Maloney combination teaches that the step of receiving application data from the one of the plurality of servers, encrypting the data, and forwarding encrypted data to the client [Ellis column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49].

Claims 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Bellaton et al U.S. Patent No. 6,473,425 B1.

As to claims 26 and 28, the Ellis-Maloney combination teaches an entry for a session ID [Maloney column 5 line 63 to column 6 line 32].

The Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach that the database includes an entry for a session comprising a TCP Sequence number and an SSL session number. The Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach that the entry includes an expected ACK.

Bellaton et al teaches entries that include a TCP Sequence number, SSL session number and an expected ACK [column 8 line 53 to column 9 line 20].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that a TCP Sequence number, SSL session number and an expected ACK would have been included in the database entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Bellaton et al, as described above, because implementing this method and by comparing a new packet to packets already queued for transmission, unnecessary duplicated transmission of a packet can be

avoided where packet transmission has been delayed. Avoiding retransmission of the queued packet avoids aggravating the network congestion [column 5 line 66 to column 6 line 7].

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Holtey et al U.S. Patent No. 5,293,424.

As to claim 30, the Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach that the data is not buffered during decryption.

Holtey et al teaches data not being buffered during decryption [column 4 line 59 to column 5 line 2].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that the data would not have been buffered during decryption.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Holtey et al, as described above, because buffering is a time consuming process and the buffered data is subject to attack [column 4 line 59 to column 5 line 2].

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Boeuf U.S. Patent No. 6,009,502.

As to claim 31, the Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach that the data is buffered for a length sufficient to complete a block cipher used to encrypt the data.

Boeuf teaches that data is buffered for a length sufficient to complete a block cipher [column 5, lines 21-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that the data would have been buffered for a length sufficient to complete a block cipher used to encrypt the data.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Boeuf, as described above, because it prevents the client from sending data when the server is no longer able to perform normal data storage operations. Such a protocol will operate to limit the amount of client vital data which might be lost [column 2, lines 36-42].

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Weinstein et al U.S. Patent No. 6,094,485.

As to claim 32, the Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach that the step of forwarding includes authenticating the decrypted data after a final segment of a multi-segment encrypted data stream is received.

Weinstein et al teaches verifying the decrypted data after a final segment of a multi-segment encrypted data stream is received [column 8, lines 37-64].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that the step of

forwarding would have included verifying the decrypted data after a final segment of a multi-segment data stream was received.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Weinstein et al, as described above, because it validates that none of the segments of data were altered during transmission by a third party.

Claims 33-35, 38, 39, 41 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 in view of Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1.

As to claims 33, 39 and 41, Ellis discloses an acceleration apparatus coupled to a public network and a secure network, communicating with a client via the public network and communicating with one of a plurality of servers via the secure network, comprising:

- a network communications interface [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

- at least one processor [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

- programmable dynamic memory [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

- a communications channel coupling the processor, memory and network communications interface [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

- a client/server open communications session manager [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49];

- a client secure communication session manager [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49]; and

a data packet encryption and decryption engine [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49],

wherein the acceleration apparatus is adapted to operate in a direct mode and a proxy mode [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49],

wherein in the direct mode the acceleration apparatus decrypts data packets received from the client and forwards the decrypted data packets to one of the servers using a communication session negotiated by the client and the server [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49],

wherein in the proxy mode the acceleration apparatus responds to the client on behalf of the server and forwards the decrypted data packets to the server using a communication session negotiated by the acceleration device and the server [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49].

Ellis does not teach a client/server secure communications session tracking database.

Maloney et al teaches a client/server secure communications session tracking database [column 6, lines 33-51].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis so that the proxy would have had a client/server secure communications session tracking database.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis by the teaching of Maloney et al because without introducing additional traffic on a network, the system produces a virtual picture of network usage and network vulnerabilities. By organizing the inputs of multiple collection tools into

visual schematics, Security Administrators become proactive in assessing network weaknesses and in identifying optimum locations for implementing security measures. With the information revealed by the system of the present invention, Security Administrators can identify potential traffic bottlenecks, locate the existence of backdoors, reduce bandwidth usage, develop profiles of users, and pinpoint illicit activity [column 1, lines 57-67].

As to claim 34, Ellis teaches that in proxy mode the client open communications session manager and secure communication manager enables the apparatus as a TCP and SSL proxy for the server, as discussed above.

As to claim 35, Ellis teaches that in direct mode the communications session managers enable transparent secure and open communication between the client and the server [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49].

As to claim 38, Ellis teaches that data packet encryption and decryption engine performs SSL encryption and decryption on data packets transmitted between the client and the at least one server, as discussed above.

As to claim 52, Ellis teaches that the acceleration apparatus automatically switches from the direct mode to the proxy mode upon detection of a communication error associated with the communication session negotiated by the client and the server [column 8 line 54 to column 9 line 49].

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Harper et al U.S. Patent No. 6,820,215 B2.

As to claim 37, the Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach a load selection manager balancing the routing of multiple open and secure communications sessions between a plurality of clients and a plurality of servers based on current processing levels of the servers.

Harper et al teaches load selection manager balancing the routing of multiple open and secure communications sessions between a plurality of clients and a plurality of servers [column 6, lines 16-29].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that there would have been a load selection manager balancing the routing of multiple open and secure communications sessions between a plurality of clients and a plurality of servers.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Harper et al, as described above, because it allows heavily accessed Web sites to increase capacity, since multiple server machines can be dynamically added while retaining the abstraction of a single entity that appears in the network as a single logical server. In addition, failure of one or more of the server machines in a server cluster need not completely disable the operation of remainder of the server cluster [column 2, lines 18-33].

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Bellaton et al U.S. Patent No. 6,473,425 B1.

As to claim 40, the Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach that the database includes a TCP Sequence number and an SSL session number.

Bellaton et al teaches entries that includes a TCP Sequence number and SSL session number [column 8 line 53 to column 9 line 20].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that a TCP Sequence number and SSL session number would have been included in the database entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Bellaton et al, as described above, because implementing this method and by comparing a new packet to packets already queued for transmission, unnecessary duplicated transmission of a packet can be avoided where packet transmission has been delayed. Avoiding retransmission of the queued packet avoids aggravating the network congestion [column 5 line 66 to column 6 line 7].

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Holtey et al U.S. Patent No. 5,293,424.

As to claim 42, the Ellis-Maloney combination is silent on the data not being buffered during decryption.

Holtey et al teaches data not being buffered during decryption [column 4 line 59 to column 5 line 2].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that the data would not have been buffered during decryption.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Holtey et al, as described above, because buffering is a time consuming process and the buffered data is subject to attack [column 4 line 59 to column 5 line 2].

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Boeuf U.S. Patent No. 6,009,502.

As to claim 43, the Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach that the data is buffered for a length sufficient to complete a block cipher used to encrypt the data.

Boeuf teaches that data is buffered for a length sufficient to complete a block cipher [column 5, lines 21-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that the data would have been buffered for a length sufficient to complete a block cipher used to encrypt the data.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Boeuf, as described above, because it prevents the client from sending data when the server is no longer able to perform normal data storage operations. Such a protocol will operate to limit the amount of client vital data which might be lost [column 2, lines 36-42].

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 and Maloney et al U.S. Patent No. 6,253,337 B1 as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Weinstein et al U.S. Patent No. 6,094,485.

As to claim 44, the Ellis-Maloney combination does not teach that client/server open communications session manager performs an authentication process that discards at least a portion of the decrypted, unauthenticated packet application data from the client prior to receiving a final segment of the application data and authenticates the decrypted data using only the remaining portion of the application data.

Weinstein et al teaches verifying the decrypted data after a final segment of a multi-segment encrypted data stream is received [column 8, lines 37-64].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination so that the step of forwarding would have included verifying the decrypted data after a final segment of a multi-segment data stream was received.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ellis-Maloney combination by the teaching of Weinstein et al, as described above, because it validates that none of the segments of data were altered during transmission by a third party.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 as applied to claim 45 above, and further in view of Holtey et al U.S. Patent No. 5,293,424.

As to claim 49, Ellis is silent on the data not being buffered during decryption.

Holtey et al teaches data not being buffered during decryption [column 4 line 59 to column 5 line 2].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis so that the data would not have been buffered during decryption.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis by the teaching of Holtey et al, as described above, because buffering is a time consuming process and the buffered data is subject to attack [column 4 line 59 to column 5 line 2].

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 B1 as applied to claim 45 above, and further in view of Harper et al U.S. Patent No. 6,820,215 B2.

As to claim 50, Ellis does not teach a load balancing engine that selects the server from a plurality of servers based on a load balancing algorithm that calculates current processing loads associated with each of the servers.

Harper et al teaches load balancing of servers [column 6, lines 16-29].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis so that the servers would have been load balanced.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ellis by the teaching of Harper et al, as described above, because it allows heavily accessed Web sites to increase capacity, since multiple server machines

can be dynamically added while retaining the abstraction of a single entity that appears in the network as a single logical server. In addition, failure of one or more of the server machines in a server cluster need not completely disable the operation of remainder of the server cluster [column 2, lines 18-33].

(10) Response to Argument

The Appellant argues that neither the Agent Server nor the Main Server in Ellis teach or suggest a direct mode in which an intermediate device utilizes a session that it did not negotiate, i.e., a session that a client and a server negotiated, to forward decrypted data packets to that server, as required by claim 1.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ellis discloses that the client authenticates to the main server. Ellis discloses that the server gets the client information including the bandwidth requirements to determine how many agents to assign to the client [column 8, lines 29-32]. Ellis discloses that the Agent server (i.e. the intermediate device) decrypts session communication and redirects this decrypted communications to the intended final destination (i.e. the client or Main Server) [column 7, lines 57-59]. The examiner asserts that the claimed limitation recites "forwarding unencrypted data packets from the intermediate device to the server using a communication session negotiated by the client and the server when the intermediate device operates in direct mode". As discussed, Ellis discloses a communication session negotiated by the client and server. However, nowhere in this limitation is it claimed that an intermediate device utilizes a session that it did not negotiate.

The Appellant argues that there is no teaching or suggestion in Ellis of decrypting encrypted data packets with an intermediate device, and forwarding unencrypted data packets

from the intermediate device to the server using a communication session negotiated by the client and the server when the intermediate device operates in direct mode, as required by claim

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Ellis discloses that the client authenticates to the main server. Ellis discloses that the server gets the client information including the bandwidth requirements to determine how many agents to assign to the client [column 8, lines 29-32]. Ellis discloses that the Agent server (i.e. the intermediate device) decrypts session communication and redirects this decrypted communications to the intended final destination (i.e. the client or Main Server) [column 7, lines 57-59].

Regarding independent claim 45, the Appellant argues that none of the intermediate devices of Ellis (i.e. the Main Server or the Agent Servers) has a communication engine that support two different modes for forwarding decrypted data to a server. The Appellant argues that no device in the Ellis system includes a communication engine that supports a direct mode in which decrypted data packets are forwarded to the servers using a communications session negotiated by the client and the server.

The examiner points out that both modes (direct and proxy) operate in similar fashions in that the intermediate device decrypts data and forwards the unencrypted data to the server. The only difference in the two modes is that in direct mode negotiation takes place between the client and server and in proxy mode the negotiation takes place between the server and the intermediate device. As discussed above, Ellis discloses the direct mode. Ellis discloses that the client authenticates to the main server. Ellis discloses that the server gets the client information including the bandwidth requirements to determine how many agents to assign to the client [column 8, lines 29-32]. Ellis discloses that the Agent server (i.e. the intermediate device)

decrypts session communication and redirects this decrypted communications to the intended final destination (i.e. the client or Main Server) [column 7, lines 57-59]. As to the proxy mode, Ellis discloses that the main server authenticates an agent [column 9, lines 51-53].

With respect to dependent claim 3, the Appellant argues that nothing in Ellis suggests modifying a SYN request.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner asserts that the modification of the SYN requests is the decryption of the requests. The requests are being altered from an encrypted state to a decrypted state.

Regarding dependent claims 51 and 53, the Appellant argues that Ellis does not describe an intermediate device that includes a communications engine that automatically switches from the direct mode to the proxy mode upon detection of a communication error with the communication session negotiated by the client and the server.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ellis discloses that if the Main Server has insufficient resources to service the session 425, then it will instruct an Agent Server(s) to become unblocked [wake up] and participate in a multiparty key exchange between a Client, Main Server and Agent Server [column 7, lines 30-34].

Regarding independent claim 20, the Appellant argues that no intermediate device in Ellis decrypts data an, in a direct mode, forwards decrypted data packets from the intermediate device to the server using a communication session negotiated by the client and the server.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Ellis discloses that the client authenticates to the main server. Ellis discloses that the server gets the client information including the bandwidth requirements to determine how many agents to assign to the client

[column 8, lines 29-32]. Ellis discloses that the Agent server (i.e. the intermediate device) decrypts session communication and redirects this decrypted communications to the intended final destination (i.e. the client or Main Server) [column 7, lines 57-59].

Regarding independent claim 33, the Appellant argues that none of the intermediary devices of Ellis support two different modes for forwarding decrypted data to a server. The Appellant argues that Ellis makes clear that the Main Server or the Agent Servers negotiate directly with the client and, therefore, simply do not utilize sessions negotiated by the client and server to forward decrypted data to the server.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, both modes (direct and proxy) operate in similar fashions in that the intermediate device decrypts data and forwards the unencrypted data to the server. The only difference in the two modes is that in direct mode negotiation takes place between the client and server and in proxy mode the negotiation takes place between the server and the intermediate device. As discussed above, Ellis discloses the direct mode. Ellis discloses that the client authenticates to the main server. Ellis discloses that the server gets the client information including the bandwidth requirements to determine how many agents to assign to the client [column 8, lines 29-32]. Ellis discloses that the Agent server (i.e. the intermediate device) decrypts session communication and redirects this decrypted communications to the intended final destination (i.e. the client or Main Server) [column 7, lines 57-59]. As to the proxy mode, Ellis discloses that the main server authenticates an agent [column 9, lines 51-53].

Art Unit: 2132

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Aravind K Moorthy/
Examiner, Art Unit 2131

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132

Conferees:

Benjamin Lanier
/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2132

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132